

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire July 6, 2004. Claims 12-25 are pending. Applicant has amended Claims 12, 17 and 21 and canceled Claims 13, 18, 19, 23 and 25. No new matter has been entered by these amendments.

Claim Rejections under §103

On page 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Bishop* (United States Patent No. 5,529,415) in view of *Goldman* (United States Patent No. 6,232,960). That rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the Claims is requested.

With respect to Claims 12 and 21 in the present application, therein is recited, *inter alia*:

*wherein the base surfaces of the dome and the pin are co-planar to define a single contact surface for contacting the device with the fingertip*

With respect to the teaching of *Bishop*, the dome 14 has a base surface 16 and an opening 22, as seen in Figure 4 thereof. However, the pin 24 appears to have a base surface at the tip of ink supply tube 28 that is secured within the holding chamber 20 of the finger portion 12, and that such base surface does not extend as far as the surface of base surface 16, as seen in Figure 4. Consequently, *Bishop* in no way shows or suggests "base surfaces of the dome and the pin are co-planar to define a single contact surface for contacting the device with the fingertip," as is recited in independent Claims 12 and 21.

As seen in Figure 4, for example, not only are the base surfaces of the dome and the pin not co-planar, a fingertip inserted into the opening of dome 14 will only touch the inside surface of dome 14, for example, as seen in Figure 1 and Figure 6. Consequently, in no way can *Bishop* be suggesting that base surfaces of the dome and the pin are co-planar to "define a single contact surface for contacting the device with the fingertip," since the fingertip in the device as shown in

*Bishop* contacts neither the base surface of the dome nor the pin. Still further, *Bishop* does not show that the "inlay" creates a "vacuum" or that the adhesive would only cover a portion of the device "such that the base surface of the inlay is exposed for direct contact with the fingertip", as is recited in independent claim 21. With respect to *Goldman*, neither a dome nor a pin is shown or suggested, consequently this element of independent Claims 12 and 21 is not shown or suggested by *Goldman*. As Applicant has shown, *Bishop* in view of *Goldman* does not show or suggest independent Claims 12 and 21, and reconsideration of the rejection of independent Claims 12 and 21, and the claims dependent thereon, is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent Claim 17 in the present application, therein are recited a number of elements that are not shown or suggested by *Bishop* in view of *Goldman*. In particular, independent Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*

*wherein each of the perimeter, the base surface, the tip, the outer wall, the inner wall, the outer cavity, and the inner cavity are rotationally symmetric about the axis, and further wherein the base surface and a portion of the inner wall are co-planar for contacting the fingertip*

While *Bishop* does describe an outer cavity 20 and an inner cavity within dome 14, in no way is outer cavity 20 "rotationally symmetric about the axis," as is recited in independent Claim 17. Further, while the base surfaces of the outer cavity 20 and the inner cavity within dome 14 are not "co-planar" within any dimension, and they make no contact with a fingertip. The only surfaces within the device 10 in contact with the fingertip are the inner wall of the cavity in dome 14, as seen in Figure 1 and Figure 6 of *Bishop*. For the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that *Bishop* in view of *Goldman* cannot show or suggest the present invention as claimed in Claims 17 and 20. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of those claims under §103.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig J. Yudell

Reg. No. 39083

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 N. Capital of Texas Highway

Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS